

# Miller, Walker, and Salmon Basin Plan Project Management Team Meeting

Date: Thursday December 11, 2003

Time: 9:00AM – 12:00PM

Location: City of Burien Council Chambers

## Meeting Summary

### ***Attendees***

Dan Bath	City of Burien
Bruce Bennett	King County
Steve Bennett	City of Normandy Park
Steve Clark	City of Burien
Curt Crawford	King County
Bob Duffner	Port of Seattle
Roger Kuykendall	Gray & Osborne (for the City of Normandy Park)
Mehrdad Moini	WSDOT
Dale Schroeder	City of SeaTac
Julie Cairn	King County

### ***Discussion of Potential Water Quality Regulatory Impacts Under Future Regulations***

Julie passed out colored basin maps showing parcels and roadways that would likely have enhanced water quality treatment requirements based on requirements in the Ecology stormwater manual and the proposed update of King County stormwater manual. This is similar to the red parcel analysis for flow control, but this is looking at water quality.

The purpose of this review was to identify potential locations or areas where water quality treatment projects might be useful.

Manual updates have identified the following zoning or land use characteristics as potentially triggering enhanced water quality requirements:

- High density single family residential (more than 8 units/acre)
- Multifamily
- Commercial and Industrial properties
- Roads other than local roads (based on transportation trip data thresholds).

In some cases, the specific King County language in the DRAFT has a greater level of specificity than is reflected above and in the parcel maps.

Action items are highlighted

These land uses have been identified as significant sources of metals in that they generate the highest concentration of metals in stormwater runoff.

It was noted that the parcels on the map were primarily identified based on zoning designation. This DOES NOT reflect actual land use, and in the case of the Port of Seattle “buy-out” properties that are now vacant, any properties zoned as industrial, commercial, multi-family, or high-density single family would be identified as triggering enhanced water quality. Additionally, these and other parcels may already be meeting or being required to meet enhanced water quality requirements. These would not be reflected on the map as such.

The PMT requested that the maps have notations added to address these points. Julie will add these notations, and she will change the water body color to a brighter blue on the Miller Creek map.

Bruce needs to talk to Water Quality staff to get additional information about phosphorous and fecal Coliform, and about ways to address Lake Garrett/Hicks water quality. He also needs their recommendations for addressing sensitive lakes and bogs.

We could look at publicly-funded projects to address hot spots or metals removal projects in the basins. Some existing areas may also naturally provide metals removal. For example, there is an area near Tub Lake that might be providing some water quality treatment due to its peat content.

Bruce to check with WQ staff to find out if there are any sphagnum bogs in the basin, and where.

As we identify potential sites for water quality treatment facilities, we need to remember that an optimal site will have some slope to it.

The PMT needs recommendations on how best to prioritize water quality projects in the basins (loading rates, proximity to streams, pollutant sources). Similar to flow control, the PMT can recommend implementing specific projects, actions, or retrofits; or they can make policy recommendations and wait for redevelopment to occur and the requirements to kick in. Both have their pros and cons. Bruce will talk to water quality staff to request assistance on how best to prioritize water quality projects.

Redevelopment rates of commercial properties are likely to be much shorter than industrial properties. Industrial properties are likely to be greater pollution generators, however.

As we look at implementing water quality requirements, we need to look at how proposed regulations address properties that redevelop with the same use and without any change in impervious coverage – will these trigger water quality treatment? Should they?

High density residential redevelopment rates are probably the longest of the high concentration land uses. How does residential redevelopment compare in priority with the other types of land uses?

The PMT discussed the efficacy of dead storage for metals removal. The PMT would benefit from a summary of water quality treatment performance information – what treatments provide what level of treatment, and for which constituents?

Action items are highlighted

#### Discussion of Ambaum Pond expansion for water quality

There is a planned development uphill of Ambaum Pond. The developer for that property also owns some land adjacent to Ambaum Pond, in an area that is a sensitive area and that would not be developable. Maybe this piece of property could be purchased and used as part of a 2-cell treatment facility. City of Burien staff are working with the developer on this project, and may be able to discuss potential use of the property adjacent to Ambaum Pond. Maybe a trade could be worked out – use of the property to address some of the developer's water quality treatment requirements as well as providing additional water quality treatment for the basin.

Bruce needs to ask Kate Rhoads how many acre-feet of storage would be needed for the Ambaum subbasin in order to provide basic and/or enhanced water quality treatment.

#### Note regarding potential use of City Light property for water quality or flow control

Steve Clark noted that the City Light property appears to have several competing potential uses in addition to drainage related uses, and that the parcel will probably not be available in its entirety for drainage related uses.

#### ***Discussion of Management Options for Flow, Water Quality, and Habitat Improvements***

Bruce handed out three individual documents containing Management Options for each of the three Basins. The PMT discussed a portion of the Miller Creek document, but did not have time to discuss either the Salmon or Walker Creek documents.

#### ***Discussion of Schedule and Upcoming Meetings***

The PMT confirmed that they **do** want the December 18 meeting to be a joint Executive Committee and PMT meeting.

The PMT discussed the scope of the next public meetings. They decided the meeting scope would be to discuss the PMT recommendations, but not to present a draft plan. If we use EIS terminology, maybe it would be a Preliminary Draft Plan. The PMT is concerned about having a document that appears too polished or too complete, because the public may feel their input is not really wanted.

The PMT concluded that public meetings in early/mid January are not practical. Late February or some time in March appear more likely. Specific dates were not set, though.

2004 PMT meeting dates proposed – 1/22, 1/29, 2/5, 2/12, 2/19, and 2/26

No public meeting dates were set.

No executive committee dates were set.

#### ***Agenda items for December 18 Exec Committee/PMT Meeting***

- Schedule update
- Quick refresher of basin goals and objectives (flow/hydraulics, water quality, habitat)

Action items are highlighted

- Review PMT flow control recommendations for the three basins, and discuss
- Review implementation options – regulatory, policies, projects
- Discuss controversial issues
- Review preliminary cost ranges of some potential strategies/projects
- Discuss next steps for getting their input and concurrence, and for presenting information to the public, and the overall project schedule